



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE ANTHROPOLOGY OF THE JEW.

WITH respect to no other people has there been so much hair-splitting controversy as regards classification as with the Jews. Antisemites and philosemites, anthropologists and historians, political reformers and sociologists, Jews and non-Jews, friends and foes alike have all differently defined and described this peculiarly persisting element. Some would call them a race, others a people, still others a religious sect, and so forth. Thus with Chamberlain, Dühring, Wagner, Woodruff and other antisemites the Jews are a race, but distinctly inferior to the so-called Aryan race; with Wirth, Topinard, Weissenberg, Fishberg, Neubauer, etc., they exist only as a social-theological organism; others, as Ripley for instance, would not call them a race but a people, who have only one element in common, and that is a peculiar facial expression.¹ Lazare, on the other hand, would not call them a race, which to him is a misnomer, since no races in the sense of ethnic unities exist, but to him they are a nation, in the sense of unity of sentiments, ideas, and ethics.² Again, Zollschan, Ruppin, Jacobs, Haupt, Andree, Sombart, Salaman, Lucien, Wolf and others believe in the comparative purity of the Jewish race, at least since the time of Ezra, 430 B. C. Zangwill, in a mood of despair, asserts that the Jews exist only as a negative unity, by force of hostile conditions. He says: "No Jewish people or nation now exists,

¹ W. Z. Ripley, *The Races of Europe*, 1899, pp. 368-400.

² B. Lazare, *Antisemitism,—its History and Causes*, 1903, p. 248.

but a multitude of individuals; their only unity being negative; the hostile hereditary vision of the ubiquitous Haman."³

In juxtaposition to this is the difficulty of identifying the Jews with any of the great subdivisions of mankind. The old Semitic affiliation has lately been called into question. Von Luschan, Ripley, Lombroso, etc., are inclined to believe that the Jews are more Aryan than Semitic. Von Luschan emphatically asserts that they are composed of three elements,—the Hittite, the Xanthecrous Nordic, whom the present Kurds resemble and who he thinks were affiliated with the Amorites of the Bible, and last the Semitic element; the first two he shows were Aryans.⁴ Haupt, like Von Luschan, believes they have descended from the Amorites, Hittites, and Armenians, but that the Hittites may have been of Mongolian origin. He also informs the writer in a personal letter that he believes that not only the Amorites but the Phenicians also came from Europe.⁵ Judt, cited by Zollschan, on the other hand, thinks the Jews are to be classed with the Alpine races.⁶ Again, there is also the question of the superiority or inferiority of the Jew, which has been so much a point of combat between antisemites and philosemites. Indeed to go into the details of the anthropology of the Jew alone would take us far beyond the scope of this article and would in fact lead us nowhere. We shall content ourselves therefore with establishing a few general facts, and in the light of those facts shall pass the verdict whether or not the Jews are to be considered as a race.

The main fault with the majority of theories lies in their one-sided attitude of partiality. The Jew is not con-

³ I. Zangwill, *The Jewish Race*, 1911, pp. 268-279; G. Spiller (ed.), *Inter-Racial Problems*.

⁴ F. von Luschan, *The Early Inhabitants of Western Asia*, pp. 221-244; *Journ. of Anthropol. Inst. Gr. Br. and Irel.*, N. S., XIV.

⁵ P. Haupt, "Die Juden," *Meyers Konversations-Lexikon*, pp. 328-330.

⁶ I. Zollschan, *Das Rassenproblem*, 1910, pp. 57-58.

sidered collectively as an integral part of an exceedingly complicated organism which we call mankind, but he is measured generally through the horoscope of one's special line of interest. The scientific antisemite, eager to prove his own superiority, considers only that side of the Jew which is below his own standard, underestimating or completely ignoring other phases in which the Jew is markedly above his standard. The same is true of the philosemite *mutatis mutandis*. So the physical anthropologist considers only the physical side, the economist the economic, the politician the political side, and so forth. Indeed it is only natural to undervalue everything outside of our own line of interest, but none the less faulty. We forget that what makes an individual and a race or people as an aggregate of individuals is an *ensemble* of many things, a totality of physical, psychical, physiological and pathological factors, and it is all of these that have to be considered.

Let us turn now to the above-indicated questions. To begin with the question of the superiority or inferiority of the Jews, we think that the common misconception is partly due to the confusion of the term "inequality" as synonymous with either superiority or inferiority. It is really of inequality of the Jew and non-Jew that we should speak, but inequality does not necessarily mean either superiority or inferiority. We cannot speak of the value of abstract qualities as equal or unequal in the sense of coincidence, as in the case of physical measurements. It is the comparison of the values of those qualities, even though different in kind and nature, that we ought to consider. Two individuals may each excel in one thing; they will be unequal in that their lines of excellence are different, but they are not necessarily superior or inferior to each other, for to society the value of the contributions of each may be of equal importance. In a like manner two races may differ in aptitudes for certain lines of endeavor, but their value

to society may be equal. It is only when a comparison of the value of the sum-total of contributions to civilization of one race has been found in a great measure less than that of the other, as would be in the case of the Australian, for instance, and any of the European races, that we may use the terms inferior or superior. Keeping this in mind, we believe that on the whole in the case of the Jew, intellectually he is neither superior nor inferior to any of the European peoples. The Jews excel in some lines and fall short in others, and so with the other races. On the whole they compare pretty well. This is borne out by Jacobs⁷ in his study of the "Distribution of Jewish Ability," showing the comparison per mileage of celebrities of Jews with Europeans. We reproduce it in full:

	EUROPEANS	JEWS
Actors	21	34
Agriculture	2	00
Antiquaries	23	26
Architects	6	6
Artists	40	34
Authors	316	223
Divines	130	105
Engineers	13	9
Engravers	3	9
Lawyers	44	40
Medicals	31	49
Merchants	12	43
Military	56	6
Miscellaneous	4	3
Metaphysics	2	18
Musicians	11	71
Natural Science	22	25
Naval	12	25

⁷ J. Jacobs, "The Distribution of Jewish Ability," *Jour. Anthropol. Inst.*, Vol. XV, pp. 351-379.

	EUROPEANS	JEWS
Philologists	13	123
Poets	20	36
Political Economy	20	26
Science	51	52
Sculptors	10	12
Sovereigns	21	12
Statesmen	125	83
Travelers	25	12

This table shows a preponderance of Jewish excellence as actors, doctors, financiers, philosophers, musicians, philologists, poets, a slight excess as antiquarians, in natural science and political economy. They are below in agriculture, novel writing, divinity, engraving, military and naval science, as sovereigns, statesmen and travelers; slightly below as painters, engineers and lawyers. They are about equal as architects, scientists and sculptors. Of course some allowance must be made for the fact that the great bulk of Russian Jewry is practically barred from obtaining eminence on account of political and social oppression, as are also German Jews from entering naval and military professions as well as from statesmanship. It is also seen from this table that Jewish ability tends more in the line of abstract thought, which is partly doubtless due, as pointed out by Jacobs, "to their long life in cities and exclusion from nature on the one side, and from education which lies in handicrafts, on the other."⁸

If we class military and naval under one head, as also sovereigns and statesmen, since they are interdependent, we see that the Jews greatly excel in 7 subjects and are below in 7; they slightly excel in 3 and are slightly below in the same number; they are equal in the others, so that both sides compare equally well. Of course there is another question as to whether the same value is to be attached

⁸ *Loc. cit.*

to the different subjects. Should we, for example, rate equally military science and philology, or agriculture and music, or philosophy and statesmanship? But I think we can easily dismiss this difficulty if we only bear in mind that it is all these combined that make up civilization and all are necessary and important links. Considering this, we can, I think, without reserve accord the Jew a place in higher civilization equal to that of any of the so-called Aryan stock.

We come to the second point: Is the Jew a Semite or an Aryan? We can easily dismiss this by simply remarking that the original composition of the Jew is absolutely of no consequence whatsoever. What matters it whether the Jews four or five thousand years ago were Hittites, Amorites, Semites, or a conglomeration of them all? It is not what entered into their their make-up, but what they are *now* that is of importance, and what they are now they are by virtue of a long history and specific phylogeny, the only things that make and create races.

And now as to the first question. Have the Jews a right to be considered as a unity, call it race, people, nation or what not? Or are they simply a heterogeneous mass with no coherence or common elements, as Fishberg's⁹ arguments would imply? We must note in the first place that the effect of environment on variation of type will be greatest with the Jews, on account of their scattered condition and frequent wanderings, change of habitat, abnormal social and economic conditions, and so forth. Concerning the effect of environment, an authority like Beddoe is inclined to believe that both pigmentation and the form of the skull are directly influenced by the kind and quality of food, apart from its sufficiency or insufficiency in quantity. Robert Gordon Latham thought that form and color might in some degree depend on the geological structure

⁹ M. Fishberg, *The Jews*, 1911.

of the habitat, the abundance of carboniferous limestone favoring development of form and complexion. Durand de Gros finds physical differences between the people of the calcareous and granitic parts of Rouergue (south of France), which he thought cannot be accounted for by difference of race. The inhabitants of the calcareous parts are of better form and complexion, while those living in the granitic country are smaller, inferior in form and complexion, less strong but more active. Excess of phosphate of lime in food seems to conduce to good physical development. Thus in Nidwalden and Ticino, two cantons in Switzerland, are found the most robust men, owing, in Beddoe's opinion, to only one point which they have in common, the consumption of great quantities of cheese, an aliment exceedingly rich in phosphate of lime.¹⁰ Again, Professor Lyde points out that pigmentation is not alone influenced by temperature but also by the amount of humidity in the air, the latter favoring fairness.¹¹ Sergi believes that the presence of blondness in North Africa, which has been advanced as an argument against the effect of environment, is to be attributed to the influence of altitude. Its center of formation was in the Atlas valleys, especially Morocco, which is a region of perpetual snow and cold, not unlike some Alpine and Apennine valleys. From there he thinks it has spread into the neighboring countries as far as the sea in Algeria and Tunis. Ridolfo Livi finds that in Piedmont, Liguria, Veneto, Emilia, Lombardy, Tuscany, Marches, Lazio, Campania, Basilicata, Calabria, Sicily and Sardinia, beyond 401 meters above sea level the blonds predominate over the brunettes, with the exception of Umbria and Abruzzi. The exception he attributes to the fact that those two provinces are hilly almost throughout, with

¹⁰ J. Beddoe, *The Anthropological History of Europe*, 1912, pp. 34-36.

¹¹ L. W. Lyde, *Climatic Control of Skin Color*, 1911, pp. 104-108; Spiller, G. (ed.), *Inter-Racial Problems*.

no marked difference between the small plain regions and the surrounding hills.¹²

Indeed, if these arguments bear any weight at all toward the explanation of fairness and darkness in general, their importance should be greater with regard to the Jews, who have been subjected to all climes and all conditions. The fact that the Jews resemble closely the peoples with whom they live, as is seen from the table given below, confirms rather than disproves the theory of climate. This has been conclusively proven by Boas, who has shown that there is a decided tendency in the offspring of immigrants to approach the native head-form. Surely mixture would not account for this change. The explanation is simple; the aborigines or the first settlers of any country have their head-form shaped by the climate and habitat, and any people migrating into the same country undergo the same change without necessarily mingling in blood. The effect on pigmentation may be the same, but the change is so much slower that it becomes perceptible only after millennia.

Following is a table taken from Fishberg¹³ showing comparison of cephalic indices of Jews and their non-Jewish neighbors.

COUNTRY	AVERAGE OF CEPHALIC INDEX OF	
	JEWS	NON-JEWS
Lithuania	81.05	81.88
Roumania	81.82	82.91
Hungary	82.45	81.40
Poland	81.91	82.13
Little Russia	82.45	82.31
Galicia	83.33	84.40

The differences as seen from this table are slight, being greatest in Roumania and Galicia, where it exceeds only

¹² G. Sergi, *The Mediterranean Race*, 1901, pp. 73-75.

¹³ M. Fishberg, *The Jews*, 1911, p. 52; F. Boas, "Changes of Bodily Form of Immigr. Desc.," *Abst. of Reports of Immig. Comm.*, Vol. II, 1911, pp. 501-556.

one unit. As intermarriages in these countries are least likely to occur, the probability of the effect of environment in tending to approximate the native head-form is still increased.

But environment is not the only factor that may explain the presence of blonds. Even heredity points that way. Experiments in the inheritance of color tend to show that whereas offspring as a rule do not exceed their parents in intensity of pigmentation, they frequently are of a lighter color, so that darker parents may produce light offspring. Davenport, on investigating the inheritance of hair-color in man, finds that out of 210 children whose parents had black hair 3 had flaxen hair, 4 yellow, 5 yellowish-brown, 8 golden, 60 light brown, 37 brown, 49 dark brown, 40 black, and 4 red. It is seen from this that 156 or fully 74 percent of the total had hair lighter than their parents. Davenport also investigated inheritance of eye-color and hair-form, and combining the results of the three investigations he concludes: "It appears that two parents with clear blue eyes and yellow or flaxen straight hair can have children only of the same type, no matter what the grandparental characteristics were; that dark-eyed and haired, curly-haired parents may have children like themselves, but also of the less developed condition."¹⁴

Of course it may be argued that these are the results of segregation or alternate inheritance in the F₂ generation in the Mendelian sense, but his expectations do not exactly tally with his results and are far from being precise, which he himself admits. It is more likely that the results are due to a slight suppression of the pigment factor, the cause of which may be physiological. In the cases of three plants—the sweet pea, the stock and the orchid—Bateson finds that the production of color depends upon a fortuitous con-

¹⁴ C. G. and G. B. Davenport, "Heredity of Hair Form in Man," *Amer. Nat.*, Vol. XLII, 1908; "Heredity of Eye Color in Man," *Science*, N. S., Vol. XXVI, 1907; "Heredity of Hair Color in Man," *Amer. Nat.*, Vol. XLIII, 1909.

course of complementary factors which are independently distributed in gametogenesis, and individuals lacking either of these factors are entirely devoid of color.¹⁵ In the same way it is possible, if one of these factors is partially suppressed by the influence of some external cause, that colors of a lesser degree of pigmentation will arise.

Lightness of color in offspring, unlike parents, may also be due to variations or mutations in the De Vries sense, not of course resulting as he thinks in the creation of an entirely new type, but in the creation of a new character. Brachycephalism among Jews may be due, as pointed out by Jacobs, to intense mental activity, greater among the Jews than any other people.

No less probable is Salaman's suggestion that the divergence in type may be due to the union of characters in gametogenesis in a way similar to that of Bateson's peas, where two apparently similar white sweet peas when mated together gave rise to a purple pea, and when the latter was interbred it produced a series of purples, reds and whites.¹⁶

Quite probably, also, blondness among Jews is to be attributed, as Von Luschan and Haupt are inclined to believe, to the original constituents of the Hebrews, the Hittites and Amorites. The objection that Fishberg raises that in that case the proportion of blonds among Jews in all parts of the world would be the same¹⁷ does not seem to us to hold, for it may be due to the unequal distribution of the blond elements, so that one place may have more and another place less than it should have in proportion to the total number of Jews in that place, aside from environmental and other factors that may produce disproportion.

But, on the other hand, if we even admit that mixture is the only cause of diversity of types among Jews, it could

¹⁵ W. Bateson, *Mendel's Principles of Heredity*, 1913, pp. 88-97.

¹⁶ R. N. Salaman, "Heredity and the Jew," *Jour. of Genetics*, Vol. I, 1910-11, pp. 273-290.

¹⁷ M. Fishberg, *The Jews*, 1911, p. 507.

hardly be explained, it seems to me, on the basis of Mendelian segregation, for since less pigmentation is usually recessive to more intense pigmentation, then in the mating of Jew and non-Jew the former will be dominant and the latter recessive as regards color of eyes and hair. Using the Mendelian formula¹⁸ we would have this:

$$\begin{array}{ll}
 DD \times RR & \text{gives all} \quad DR \\
 DR \times RR & \text{"} \quad IDR : IRR \\
 DR \times DD & \text{"} \quad IDD : IDR \\
 DR \times DR & \text{"} \quad IDD : 2DR : IRR
 \end{array}$$

We must add by way of information for the enlightenment of the general reader that the terms "dominant" and "recessive" as used in Mendelian literature designate the degree of manifestation of one or the other of the individual parental characters in the offspring of two crossed varieties or species, commonly known as hybrid. Hence any character such as size, form, color, etc., which is transmitted entire or almost unchanged in hybridization is termed "dominant," and that which becomes latent in the process "recessive," the latter meaning that the character has either withdrawn or entirely disappeared in the hybrid but may nevertheless reappear again in their progeny. The symbols used to express the relationship of any two pairs of characters are DD "dominant" and RR "recessive" and their combinations, while F₁ denotes first hybrid generation, F₂ second hybrid generation, and so on.

With this in mind, analyzing the above formulas we see the F₁ generation will all appear dominant, in this case of the color of Jewish hair and eyes. When F₁ marries again non-Jewish we shall expect the offspring equally divided between light and dark, but we must note that in this case where the non-Jewish marriage occurred for two generations in succession the third generation, which

¹⁸ W. Bateson, *Mendel's Principles of Heredity*, 1913, p. 12.

should contain blond hair and light eyes, will be in the non-Jewish fold. If we take another possible combination, that of $DR \times DD$, in this case hybrid and Jew, the result will be $1DD:1DR$, or all the offspring appearing dark, so that even if the second generation should marry Jewish and become a member of the community the hair and eyes of the third generation will still appear Jewish and the type of the Jews unchanged. If we take the third combination, where two hybrids intermarry, we shall have non-Jewish color of hair and eyes appearing only in the proportion of $1:3$, but the question is in the first place whether hybrids marrying *inter se* will turn to the Jewish or to the non-Jewish fold, very likely to the latter; in the second place, marriages of hybrids of Jews and non-Jews are least likely to occur, owing, as Salaman pointed out, to the greater choice the hybrid has in finding his mate either in the Jewish community or outside of it. He himself in testing the heredity of the Jewish expression by the Mendelian principle could not find a single example of hybrid mating with hybrid.¹⁹ It is clear, therefore, that the hypothesis of mixture as an explanation for the presence of blond hair and blue eyes among the Jews entirely fails when considered in the Mendelian sense. Surely the number of such cases would be if not *nil*, at least so small that it could produce no perceptible change.

But let us not forget that the problem of heredity of color in man is far from being settled, aside from other considerations, because of the complexity of the transmission of the various color characters. Even Bateson points out that only the inheritance of eye-color alone has been established with any clearness, but with respect to hair-color nothing can yet be said with confidence.²⁰ The task is much more difficult in the intercrossing of races.

¹⁹ R. N. Salaman, "Heredity and the Jew", *Jour. of Genetics*, Vol. I, pp. 273-290.

²⁰ W. Bateson, *Mendel's Principles of Heredity*, Cambridge, 1913, p. 205.

Indeed, so many are the factors involved in the inheritance of characteristics in man that no one factor, and the least of all mixtures, can be taken as the only cause. Brinton believes that the variability of traits within the racial limits is an ethnic principle, and that this becomes greater as the race is higher in the scale of organic development. To quote: "No race remains closer to its type than the Austafrican, none departs from it so constantly as the Eurafican. Wherever we find the unmixed white race we find its blond and brunette varieties, its prognathic and orthognathic jaws, its long-skulled and broad-skulled heads. To establish genealogic schemes exclusively on their differences, as has been the work of so many living anthropologists, is to build houses of cards."

Researches conducted by Virchow, De Candolle, Kollman and others disclosed the fact that in the same city and the same family the children are born brunettes or blonds, dark or light eyed, and to some degree broad or narrow skulled, regardless of their parents' peculiarities.²¹ Indeed the writer himself can testify from his own observations, perhaps taking himself as an example, of cases who are of pure Jewish descent, and who can trace their ancestry back for several generations, and who not alone have blond or brown hair but present various ethnic traits in various combinations. But on the other hand the Jews after all are not entirely devoid of common physical characters: they are certainly no more heterogeneous as regards head-form and complexion, the only characters that can be relied on safely in anthropology, than any of the other European races if we except the Jews of Cochin China, the Falashas of Abyssinia and the Samaritans, who in our opinion should not be classed as Jews. Historically the Samaritans have never been part and parcel of the Jewish people; they have not undergone the same shaping and

²¹ D. G. Brinton, *Races and Peoples*, 1890, pp. 108-109.

moulding under the same rod by the same forces that have made the Jew as we see him in Europe to-day, even though we admit that they are of common origin, since it is not the genetic but the developmental factors that create a race; not what it was, but what it is. A belief in the Jewish religion alone does not by any means make one a Jew, any more than a negro would be reckoned as belonging to the Anglo-Saxon or Teutonic race because like them he believes in Christianity. It is, besides, a question whether even by origin they could be classed as Jews. Peschel in a footnote emphatically states that the black Jews of Cochin are natives of India, purchased as slaves by true white Jews, and received into the community after the fulfilment of the Mosaic rites.²² Rohlf's, cited by Jacobs, denies Jewish features even to the Falashas; they are only a negroid element converted to Judaism.²³ The Samaritans are a hybrid people of Jews, Moabites and Amorites, but owing to their complete geographical isolation and practical non-mingling with the other Jews they have not shared in the historical process with the bulk of the other Jews, and cannot properly from a scientific point of view be included in the Jewish race. The same applies to the Karaites, the Daggatauns of the Sahara, the Beni Israel of Bombay, and other tribes in China and elsewhere, which can be reckoned only as religious sects, adhering to the tenets of the Hebrew religion, but not forming part of the Jewish race. The Jews that constitute the Jewish race are those of Europe, Asia Minor and North Africa, and especially those of Russian Poland, Austria and Germany, and the United States, and if we confine ourselves to these, as we should, we shall presently see that they present remarkable uniformity in headform and complexion.

²² O. Peschel, *The Races of Men*, 1906, p. 11.

²³ J. Jacobs, "On the Racial Characteristics of Modern Jews", *Jour. of Anthropol. Inst.*, Vol. XV, 1886, p. 43.

The following table compiled by Ripley²⁴ gives the cephalic indices as found by various investigators at different times:

AUTHORITY	PLACE	NUMBER	CEPH. INDEX
Lombroso (1894)	Turin, Italy	112	82.0
Weisbach (1877)	Balkan States	19	82.2
Majer and Kopernicki (1877) ..	Galicia	316	83.6
Blechmann (1882)	W. Russia	100	83.21
Stieda (1883)	Minsk, Russia	67	82.2
Ikoff (1884)	Russia	120	83.2
Majer and Kopernicki (1885) ..	Galicia	100	81.7
Jacobs (1890)	England	363	80.0
Jacobs (1890)	England (Sephardim) ..	51	
Talko-Hryniewicz (1892)	Lithuania	713	
Deniker (1898)	Caucasia	53	85.2
Weissenberg (1895)	S. Russia	100	82.5
Weissenberg (1895)	S. Russia	50 (women)	82.4
Gluck (1896)	Bosnia (Spagnoli)	55	80.1
Livi (1896)	Italy	34	81.6
Elkind (1897)	Poland	325 { (men)	81.9
		(women)	82.9
Deniker (1898)	Daghestan	19	87.0
Ammon (1899)	Baden	207	83.5
Ikoff (1884)	Constantinople	17	74.5

The cephalic indices as seen from this table taken at random among Jews of various countries range from 80 to 83, with the exception of Caucasasia, Daghestan and Constantinople, being greatest in Daghestan and smallest in Constantinople, although we cannot attach much weight to these extreme cases, since there the number of observations are so few. From this we excluded Ikoff's observations on 30 Caraims in Crimea with a cephalic index of 83.3, who as we said before cannot be classed properly with the Jews. But what is remarkable is the fact that the observations in Russia, Galicia, Poland, Italy and Baden present the least differences, not exceeding two units which may well be attributed to individual variation. Of all these only .08 are dolichocephalic, while all the rest (fully 99.92 percent) are brachycephalic.

The greatest argument against uniformity of skull is

²⁴ W. Z. Ripley, *The Races of Europe*, 1899, pp. 368-400.

based on the assumption that the Sephardic Jews, as distinguished from the Ashkenazim, are dolichocephalic. This has never been founded on facts, for the observations made are exceedingly few; but what is more, from such data as is available, even among them the majority are brachycephalic. This is seen from the above table in the case of the Jews from Bosnia and Italy. Jacobs in London finds among the Sephardim about 11 percent even less pure long-headed than among Ashkenazim.²⁵ Ikoff is the only one who found Sephardim dolichocephalic, but since he observed only 17 crania, no weight can be attached to his results.

Von Luschan made measurements of 1222 Jews, 52 percent of whom were Sephardim of Smyrna, Constantinople, Makri and Rhodes, while the rest were Ashkenazim from Vienna, Austria.²⁶ Unfortunately he does not give the numbers and indices corresponding to each, but from his curve we find only 47 out of a total of 244, or 19 percent, are dolichocephalic, only 33, or 13 percent, are mesocephalic, while the remaining 68 percent are brachycephalic. Of course we do not know how many of the Sephardim were actually brachycephalic, but the exceedingly small percentage of dolichocephals makes it probable that the majority were brachycephalic. Besides, his curve is faulty in that it contains only one-fifth of the actual number, and we are inclined to think that the author picked out only those that show great variance in head-form, in order to prove the extreme variability of the head-form among Jews, a point which he is trying to bring out. We have no doubt the curve would have been different had the total number been plotted, but even as it is it shows up favorably the other way.

²⁵ J. Jacobs, "On The Racial Characteristics of Modern Jews", *Jour. of Anthropol. Inst.*, 1886, pp. 23-63.

²⁶ F. von Luschan, "The Early Inhabitants of Western Asia", *Jour. of the Anthropol. Inst. Gr. Brit. and Ire.*, pp. 221-244.

The same uniformity is to be seen from the following additional figures obtained by other observers:²⁸

PLACE	NUMBER	OBSERVER
U. S. Immigr. from Galicia	83.33	Fishberg
U. S. Immigr. from S. Russia . .	82.45	Fishberg
W. Russia	81.05	Fishberg
England	80.00	Jacobs
U. S. Immigr. from Poland	81.91	Fishberg
U. S. Immigr. from Roumania .	81.82	Fishberg
U. S. Immigr. from Hungary . .	82.45	Fishberg
U. S.	81.05	Fishberg
U. S. Immigr. from Persia	81.77	Fishberg
U. S. Immigr.	83.00	Boas
U. S.	81.4	Boas

The difference in all these does not exceed 2, with the exception of England which shows a difference of 3. What is rather remarkable is the exceeding uniformity of all the immigrant Jews in this country, the difference being less than two.

Turning to complexion we find that the brunette type is prevalent, the blonds not exceeding 30 percent anywhere, and being doubtless a result of individual variation. Thus Majer and Kopernicki in Galicia, cited by Ripley, found dark hair to be about twice as frequent as light. Elkind, in Warsaw, finds about three-fifths of the men dark. In Bosnia, Glück found only 2 light-haired men out of 55. In Germany pure brunette types are three times as frequent as light, while in Austria they are twice as frequent among Jewish children as among Christian.²⁹ Of 60,000 Jewish schoolchildren examined in the latter country only 27 percent had blond hair. In Hungary 24 percent of Jewish children had fair hair, in Bulgaria 22 percent. Of 600

²⁸ M. Fishberg, *Die Rassenmarkmale der Juden*, 1913, p. 29.

²⁹ W. Z. Ripley, *The Races of Europe*, 1899, p. 391.

children examined by Fishberg in the schools of the Alliance Israelite in Algiers, Constantine and Tunis only 6 percent had fair hair. Among 4235 Jews observed by the same author³⁰ in New York the following proportions were found:

	JEWS	JEWESSES
Brunette type	52.62%	56.94%
Blond type	10.42%	10.27%
Mixed types	36.96%	32.79%

This table shows only 10.42 percent pure blonds. In the mixed types are included those who have dark hair with fair eyes or *vice versa*, among whom a large percentage must have been of dark complexion. We must bear in mind that a large majority of children become darker in complexion with growing age. Fishberg also finds in North Africa only 4.62 percent of pure blonds. In Bulgaria Wateff found only 8.71 percent blonds. In Austria again, according to districts, Schimmer found only 8 to 14 percent blonds. "Altogether," in Fishberg's words, "it appears that the proportion of Jews of pure blond type oscillates between 5 and 16 percent, according to the country of birth."³¹

Nor is there any striking difference in complexion between the Ashkenazim and the Sephardim. Jacobs³² gives the following data:

(a)	LIGHT EYES NEUTRAL EYES DARK EYES		
290 Sephardim	20	12	68
375 Ashkenazim	27	14	59

(b)	RED HAIR	FAIR HAIR	BROWN HAIR	DARK HAIR	BLACK HAIR
290 Seph.	3.5	3.5	15.7	40.0	37.3
375 Ashk.	1.1	2.6	17.0	45.6	32.7

³⁰ M. Fishberg, *The Jews*, 1911, pp. 63-66.

³¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 66-68.

³² J. Jacobs, "On the Racial Characteristics of Modern Jews," *Jour. of Anthropol. Inst.*, 1886, pp. 23-63

The only marked difference between the two, as seen from this table, is in the frequency of erythrism, which is about three times as frequent among the Sephardim, but the percentage however appear to be large, due to the small number observed. If we combine the brown, dark and black, all of which should really be classed as brunettes, and also the red and fair as blonds, we have 93 percent of brunettes among Sephardim against 95.3 percent among Ashkenazim. The eyes show greater difference, but no definite correlation has been established between hair and eyes, and we think that the hair only can be relied upon to designate complexion. Of course the differences vary in different countries, but what is significant is the fact that the dark type is prevalent in both the Ashkenazim and Sephardim.

The prevalence of dark complexion is also borne out by another table taken from Fishberg,⁸⁸ which shows the percentage of dark and fair hair among 2272 Jews of New York City.

COLOR	JEWS	JEWESSES
Dark Hair	83.49%	80.17%
Fair Hair	13.98%	16.14%
Red Hair	2.53%	3.69%

Thus we see that even from the strictly anthropological view-point the heterogeneity of type among the Jews is quite small, certainly not enough to ascribe it to mixture, and certainly less than among other peoples. Shall we say that the Teutons, for example, are less heterogeneous, comprising as they do the Saxons and Hanoverians in the north, who speak *plattdeutsch*; the Netherlands and Flemings of the north of Belgium, who speak Flemish or Dutch; the southern Germans; the Alemanni of German Switzer-

⁸⁸ M. Fishberg, "Phys. Anthropol. of the Jews," *Amer. Anthropol. N. S.* 5, 1903, pp. 89-106.

land, Alsace and Baden; the Swabians of Württemberg and Bavaria; the Bavarians of eastern Bavaria and of Austria, who speak *hochdeutsch*; the inhabitants of middle Germany, the Thuringians, Franconians, etc., who speak *mitteldeutsch*; finally, the Prussians, partly composed of Germanized Slavo-Lithuanian elements?

The same is true of the Slavs, among whom, in Deniker's words, "it is useless to look for a 'Slav Type.'" In the east we have the Great, Little and White Russians; in the west the Poles of Russian Poland, western Galicia, Posen and eastern Prussia, the Wends or Sorobes of Saxony and the Prussian province of Saxony, who are undergoing a process of Germanization; the Bohemians of Bohemia and a part of Moravia; the Slovaks of Moravia and Hungary. In the south there are the Slovenes or Slovintsi of Austria-Hungary, the Khorvates of Hungary, the Serbs of Servia, the Morlacks, etc., of Dalmatia; the Herzegovinians, Bosnians, Montenegrins or Tsarnagortsi in other parts of the Balkan peninsula; and finally the Bulgarians, who are of Turco-Finnish origin, but Slavonized for at least ten centuries. And so are all the other European and Asiatic peoples.³⁴

But more important than physical characteristics are the physiological, pathological and psychological, which are common to the Jewish people as a whole. Of these we can only mention a few. Thus Jacobs in his studies of Jewish biostatics comes to the following conclusions:

1. "Jews have a less marriage rate, less birth rate, and less death rate than their neighbors, but the less marriage and birth rate are due in large measure to the less mortality of Jewish children. The larger number of children living causes the percentage of marriages and births, really larger as regards adults, to seem smaller when reckoned on the whole population."

³⁴ J. Deniker, *The Races of Man*, 1900, pp. 339-348.

2. "Jews and Jewesses marry earlier than the surrounding population. Cousins inter-marry more frequently, perhaps three times as often."

3. "Jews have larger families, though fewer plural births. On the other hand, mixed marriages between Jews and persons of other races are comparatively infertile."

4. "In Jewish confinements there are more boys, less still-births, and fewer illegitimate births, though the advantage as to still-births disappears among Jewish illegitimate children."

5. "Jews have a smaller mortality of children under five, but this does not hold of Jewish illegitimate children, who die off at much the same high rate as the unfortunate beings of the same class in other sects. Jewish deaths over sixty are generally greater in proportion. Jews commit suicide less frequently."

6. "It has been frequently asserted that Jews enjoy an immunity from certain diseases, notably phthisis and cholera, but the evidence I have on this point is adverse to the claims. There is some indication that they are liable to diabetes and haemorrhoids, and they have certainly more insane, deaf-mutes, blind, and color-blind persons."⁸⁵

The same results were found by Hoffman, Kolb Bergmann, Legoyt, Dernouilli, Lagneau, Loeb and many others.

Lucien Wolf and Dr. Asher who had several years' experience as surgeons to the Jewish Board of Guardians, affirm Jewish immunity from phthisis. Dr. Asher states that in his experience phthisis among English Jews is unknown. This is substantiated by the statistics in the report for 1859 of Dr. Septimus Gibbon, Medical Officer of Health.⁸⁶

Venereal diseases have been found less frequent among

⁸⁵ J. Jacobs, "On the Racial Characteristics of Modern Jews," *Jour. of Anthropol. Inst.*, Vol. XV, 1886, pp. 26-27.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 56-61.

Jews. Dr. A. Cohen, late Senior House Surgeon of the Metropolitan Free Hospital, London, gives the following figures:³⁷

	MEN		WOMEN		CHILDREN	
	NO.	PERCENT	NO.	PERCENT	NO.	PERCENT
Jews	122	17.8	10	20.0	153	3.3
Others . . .	539	62.0	192	62.6	367	15.8

The percentage of the first two rubrics are those of syphilitic cases, the next two are those of gonorrhea, and the last two are those of congenital syphilis observed in the number of children examined.

Cancer is less frequent among Jews. Jacques Bertillon, cited by Fishberg, gives the following figures showing the deaths from cancer per hundred thousand population for different peoples during the years 1903-1908 in Algiers.

French (native)	40
French (naturalized)	18
Jews (naturalized)	21
Spaniards	33
Italians	38

The figures for Amsterdam given by Dr. J. J. Von Konijnenburg are of the same nature.³⁸ Thus:

	MEN	WOMEN
Jews (1898-1902)	60	77
Gen. Population . . (1897-1902)	90	98

In London during 1898-1900 the proportion per hundred of deaths from cancer to deaths due to all causes among persons over twenty years of age was as follows:

	1900	1899	1898
Jews	6.1	6.5	5.02
General Population	8.4	8.8	6.1

³⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 31-32.

³⁸ M. Fishberg, *Die Rassenmerkmale der Juden*, 1913, pp. 117-118.

Jewish children have everywhere been found to suffer less from diseases of the digestive organs. Thus, in Budapest, Körösi finds the death rate from infantile diarrhea during the period 1860-90 to have been as follows per hundred thousand children under five years of age:

Catholics	4143
Lutherans	3762
Calvinists	3293
Other Protestants	3498
Jews	1442

In Vienna Rosenfeld finds the mortality of Jewish children from diarrhea to be only 61 per one hundred thousand population, as opposed to 137 of Protestants and 186 Catholics. In New York, Fishberg³⁹ calculated from the reports of the Department of Health that during 1897-99 the annual mortality from diarrhea diseases in the entire city was 125.54 per one hundred thousand population, while in the most congested districts, largely inhabited by Jews, it was only 106.79.

The Jew has been found to be deficient in stature, breadth of chest, and lung capacity, by Jacobs, Majer and Kopernicki, Stieda, Glück and others, but in spite of that his tenacity for life has been unprecedented. Especially is this true in the United States. This may be shown by comparing the vital statistics of the Jews as elaborated by Billings in the census of 1890, with that of the general population.⁴⁰ It is also seen from the following table given by Hoffman,⁴¹ showing the death rate per one thousand population in the seventh, tenth and thirteenth wards of New York City, 1890, by place of birth:

³⁹ M. Fishberg, *The Jews*, 1911, pp. 306-312.

⁴⁰ D. G. Brinton, *Races and Peoples*, 1890.

⁴¹ W. Z. Ripley, *The Races of Europe*, 1899, p. 384.

AGES	TOTAL DEATHS PER 1000	U. S. INCLUDING COLORED	IRELAND	GERMANY	RUSSIA AND POLAND (MOSTLY JEWS)
Total	26.25	45.18	36.04	22.14	16.71
Under 15 years	41.28	62.25	40.71	30.38	32.31
15 to 25 years.	7.55	9.43	15.15	7.14	2.53
25 to 65 years.	21.64	25.92	39.51	21.20	7.99
65 and over . . .	104.72	105.96	120.92	88.51	84.51

As seen from this table mortality among Jews is a little less than one-third of the general population, a little less than one-half for persons under 15, about one-fourth for ages 15 to 25, less than one-fourth for ages 25 to 65, only slightly less however for ages 65 and over.

Considering Jewish biostatics as a whole it would seem to indicate that the Jews are physiologically and pathologically superior to their neighbors, except as regards insanity, deaf-mutism and blindness, but even in these Billings's figures show up favorably. Thus, for example, the proportions per one hundred thousand of population of insane and idiots reported among Jews is 44.5, while that reported by the United States census of 1880 was 336.6, and by the Massachusetts census of 1885 it was 355.3. For deaf-mutes among Jews the proportion was 31.3 per one thousand as opposed to 67.5 by the tenth census of the United States, and 42.6 by the Massachusetts census of 1885.⁴² This is not however borne out by all the European figures, and may be due, as Billings suggests, to incorrect reports.

Of course there are differences as to locality, and some investigators confining themselves entirely to one locality are inclined to deny or add one or the other characteristic,

⁴² J. S. Billings, *Vital Statistics of the Jews in the U. S.*, Vol. I, No. 19, pp. 1-23.

but by far the greater number of the reports show these differences to be characteristic. Whatever the causes may be, whether dietary laws, family hygiene, beautiful home life, or a result of a long process of selection, the fact remains that those characters are met with in practically every Jewish community.

Intellectually, we have also seen in the beginning of this essay how Jewish intellect tends in a particular direction. This doubtless may be a result, as Lazare points out, of a long continued study of the Torah and Talmud, which shaped the Jewish brain and gave it a characteristic type.⁴³

And finally we come to what we consider the most important factor, namely the psychic personality of the race. We have marshalled up all this evidence thus far, and argued both positively and negatively, in order to show that no matter from what angle you approach the problem, whether environmental, hereditary or physiological, the arguments are in favor of the comparative purity of the Jewish race. By this we do not mean that the Jews have abstained from intermarriage, but rather that, by the nature of the facts, the Jew not being of the dominant race and considered more or less a stranger, the majority of those that intermarried left the Jewish fold forever, and the exceedingly small percentage that remained in the community could not possibly affect the Jewish type, certainly not to any noticeable extent. But let us reiterate, After all, of what import is mixture or non-mixture? Ethnically there is no pure race. The old polygenistic view has long been abandoned by men of science. It is conceded by anthropologists that the modern races have not sprung up independently, but have had a common origin. It is not the origin however but the phylogenetic development that a group of individuals, irrespective of its primary constituents, undergoes that finally moulds it into a distinct

⁴³ B. Lazare, *Antisemitism,—Its History and Causes*, 1903, p. 256.

unit, or what we commonly call race. It is the complete assimilation and fusion of the constituents as a result of long periods of in-breeding and subjection to similar conditions and customs that makes the race. The *summum bonum* of the phylogeneticism is the psychic personality, the soul or race consciousness, if you choose, of each race; and if this is true of any people it is especially true of the Jews, who have tenaciously displayed it in the face of all opposition, with no political boundaries and no center of their own. The characteristic Jewish expression, which even Ripley, Fishberg and Weissenberg do not deny, is, as Fishberg thinks, "the expression of the Jewish soul";⁴⁴ but, unlike him, we maintain that it is the most potent, determining factor for each and every race, that it is by far the best guide for distinguishing one race from the other; and while physical characters fail, being as they are subject to environment, physiological, and other changes, it persists in spite of all outward changes. That this is so with the Jews is remarkably affirmed by Salaman's study, who found it to Mendelize, and whose results we give here:

FIRST GENERATION					
NO. OF FAMILIES	FATHER	MOTHER	GENTILES	CHILDREN JEWS	INTER- MEDIATES
50	Gentile	Jewess	88	15	4
86	Jew	Gentile	240	11	4
Total 136			328	26	8

Out of a total of 136 families tested, of which 50 consisted of father Gentile and mother Jewess, and 86 father Jewish and mother Gentile, there were 328 offspring of Gentile appearance, 26 Jewish, and 8 intermediates; but since the intermediates were more Gentile-looking than

⁴⁴ M. Fishberg, *The Jews*, 1911, p. 165.

Jewish, the result is 336 Gentile-looking against 26 Jewish, or the ratio of 13.1. The Mendelian expectation which should have given absolute dominance is short by one, which Salaman attributes to the bias of his observers, who, being zealous Jews, may have taken non-Jewish-looking for Jewish, but what is more probable is the possibility that the non-Jewish parent had Jewish blood. This he actually found to be the case in one family, whose pedigree we reproduce here. All the other families refused to give their genealogies. It may also be due to incomplete dominance, which is quite prevalent even among lower animals and in plants.

Of mating of hybrid and hybrid, Salaman could not find any cases, but he tested 13 families, of which 9 were matings between hybrid mother and Jewish father, and 4, hybrid father and Jewish mother. They had a total of 15 children Gentile-looking and 17 Jewish, as is seen from the following table:

NO. OF FAMILIES	FATHER	MOTHER	CHILDREN	
			GENTILE	JEW
9	Jew	Hybrid	13	12
4	Hybrid	Jewess	2	5
<hr/> Total 13			<hr/> 15	<hr/> 17

The results as seen from the table fall short of expectation only in two cases. In a personal communication with Dr. Salaman he informs us that he has now additional data which bear out the same results, but which he has not published on account of the war. The results show clearly that the Jewish facial expression behaves as a recessive character to the Gentile, but that it is hereditary just the same. On the other hand the non-Jewish appearance frequently met with among Jews was found by

Salaman to behave as recessive to the pure Jewish appearance.⁴⁵

The persistence of the Jewish type is also beautifully illustrated in Galton's composite photograph compounded of a number of photographs of Jewish boys from the Jews' Free School, London.⁴⁶ The typical Jewish expression is remarkably displayed.

It is quite clear that the facial expression of the Jew is a true character, and that therefore the inner psychic personality of the race, of which it is only the outward manifestation, is likewise true and fundamental. The question has been raised as to what has caused the Jewish expression. Some think it is largely a result of long exile and social isolation, as Jacobs suggests; Ripley thinks it is a matter of artificial selection; Fishberg thinks much of it is due to the Jewish costume, etc. But if we keep in mind that the race is the totality of all the elements that have played a part in its history, we can easily see that the expression is a reflection of all the forces that shaped the destiny of the Jewish people. It is neither the result solely of Ghetto life, least likely is it a result of artificial selection, nor can dress and social surroundings change it; they may make it less accentuated, but the features cannot be demolished. In a word, it is not, in our mind, the result of any one thing, but it is a fusion of all the elements that made the Jew as we know him to-day. If we were asked to give those elements we would name them as follows: The sublimity and righteous indignation of the prophets and scribes; the pathos and tragedy of ages of persecution and martyrdom; the cunning and shrewdness that is characteristic of all people who have to live by their wits; a shade of anger or resentment. Finally, we see in the

⁴⁵ R. N. Salaman, "Heredity and the Jews," *Jour. of Genetics*, Vol. I, 1910-11, pp. 273-290.

⁴⁶ J. Jacobs, "On the Racial Characteristics of Modern Jews, *Jour. of Anthropol. Inst.*, Vol. XV, 1886, pp. 23-63.

Jewish expression the calculation, coldness and scanning which so struck Galton, and which we think is a result of long experience in financial operations. All these elements have by long use and repetition fused and become hereditary. The non-uniformity of expression among the different members of the race are due to differences of individual experience.

And now the question will be asked, If the expression persists does it follow that the racial consciousness will likewise persist? We have mentioned before that the expression is only the physical manifestation of the psychic, and we are inclined to believe with Von Luschan, Wirth and others that race consciousness may never disappear. At any rate, what the future holds cannot be prognosed, but the present shows that race consciousness, far from declining, is being enhanced, and this not only among the Christian peoples but among the Jews as well, and no less among American Jewry than among European. We have clear evidence of this in the remarkable progress of the Menorah societies among Jewish students all over the country. Founded in 1906 as a local society at Harvard, it has now spread all over and became intercollegiate with a separate organ of its own. The chancellor calls attention to the fact that within the last two years Menorahs have grown from nineteen to thirty-five, and this without the slightest agitation on the part of those interested in the movement. Of course the actual members make up only a small percentage of the great bulk of Jewish students, but let us not forget that by far the majority of students, if they for some reason or other do not actively participate, are decidedly in full sympathy with the movement. We have come in contact with all kinds of Jewish students, rich and poor, European or American born, first, second and third generations, east and west, in large and small

Jewish communities, and we know that the sentiments are the same all over.

Not only Menorahs but distinctly Jewish organizations are being formed all along among all classes of people. Y. M. H. A's., Herzl, Montefiore, Disraeli, Judea and numerous other clubs and societies are growing at a tremendous rate; needless to mention Jewish philanthropic agencies. True, religion with Israel is decaying, as it is with all other peoples, making place for broader humanistic conceptions, for a religion on earth, but the religion is not the race. True religion in Israel has played perhaps the most important part in the making of the Jewish race, but it cannot function in its unmaking. The Jew remains a Jew with or without the religion. Nihilist, atheist, or agnostic, he is still a Jew in sentiments and spirit. Divided as the Jews are among themselves, they display unexampled solidarity when anything threatens the whole race. Orthodox and reformed, believer and free-thinker, rich and poor alike, all rally together and form a compact solid wall. Even the proselyte, deceiving as he does his own conscience, is no less a Jew in spirit; and the same is true of the assimilator. Strange to say, Fishberg himself, perhaps the staunchest advocate for assimilation whether by preference or some other reason, prefers to pursue his activities in the Jewish fold and even engages in pure Jewish philanthropy. In short, we firmly believe that the race-consciousness, or what we have termed the psychic personality of the race, in a Freudian sense, which alone is its true determiner, is fully alive with the Jew, and if not extinguishable altogether we may be certain that, for good or bad, it will remain so for a long time to come.

In view of all that has been said in this article we believe that, if the privilege, if such it be, to be called a race is given to any people, it should certainly be given to

the Jews, who, unlike any other people, possess all the characteristics that enter in the make-up of races.

To sum up: We have pointed out the confusion that exists as regards the anthropology of the Jew,—the question as to whether the Jews are a race or religious sect, etc., whether they are Semites, and whether they are superior or inferior to the Aryan races. We showed, as regards the latter, that intellectually they are neither inferior nor superior, but that physiologically they are slightly above their neighbors. The second question we dismissed as being irrelevant. As regards the first question we showed that from all points of view,—environmental, hereditary, strictly anthropological and physiological,—the arguments are against the hypothesis of mixture; and finally we showed that irrespective of mixtures, which are of minor importance when taking place at a remote period, the Jew above all presents a distinct psychic unity, which alone we think can be taken as a safe criterion of any race, and that, in view of all that has been said, if any people is entitled to be designated as a race, it is certainly the Jews.

LOUIS D. COVITT.

CLARK UNIVERSITY, WORCESTER, MASS.